

Copyright, Trademark, and Patent 2013-2014

VEI. 3

Patent

Professor Abraham Drassinower

STORAGE

KE 2799 .D73 2013 v.3 c.1

BORA LASKIN LAW LIBRARY

JAN - 6 2014

FA.D.LTY OF LAW UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Copyright, Trademark, and Patent 2013-2014

Patent

Professor Abraham Drassinower

Digitized by the Internet Archive in 2018 with funding from University of Toronto

Volume 3 Patents Table of Contents

Presumption of validity	
Diversified Products Corp. v. Tye-Sil Corp. (1991), 35 C.P.R. (3d) 350 (F.C.A.)	
Novelty	
Reeves Brothers Inc. v. Toronto Quilting & Embroidery Ltd. (1978), 43 C.P.R. (2d) 145 (F.C.T.D.) Diversified Products Corp. v. Tye-Sil Corp. (1991), 35 C.P.R. (3d) 350 (F.C.A.) Apotex Inc. v. Sanofi-Synthelabo Canada Inc., 2008 SCC 61	
Obviousness/Inventive Step	
Beecham Canada Ltd. et al. v. Procter & Gamble Co. (1982), 61 C.P.R. (2d) 1 (F.C.A.) Beloit Canada Ltd. et al. v. Valmet Oy (1986), 8 C.P.R. (3d) 289 (F.C.A.) Diversified Products Corp. v. Tye-Sil Corp. (1991), 35 C.P.R. (3d) 350 (F.C.A.) Apotex Inc. v. Sanofi-Synthelabo Canada Inc., 2008 SCC 61	2
Utility	
X v. Commissioner of Patents (1981), 59 C.P.R. (2d) 7 (F.C.A.)	55
Subject Matter	
Harvard College v. Canada (Commissioner of Patents), [2002] 4 S.C.R. 45	89
Sufficiency of the Patent Specification	
Consolboard Inc. v. MacMillan Bloedel (Saskatchewan) Ltd., [1981] 1 S.C.R. 504 (S.C.C.) Beecham Canada Ltd. et al. v. Procter & Gamble Co. (1982), 61 C.P.R. (2d) 1 (F.C.A.)	
Infringement	
Catnic Components Ltd. v. Hill and Smith Ltd., [1982] R.P.C. 183 (H.L.)	. 174 . 178

